



State of Utah

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
DIVISION OF OIL, GAS AND MINING

1594 West North Temple, Suite 1210
PO Box 145801
Salt Lake City, Utah 84114-5801
(801) 538-5340 telephone
(801) 359-3940 fax
(801) 538-7223 TTY
www.nr.utah.gov

Michael O. Leavitt
Governor
Robert L. Morgan
Executive Director
Lowell P. Braxton
Division Director

December 18, 2002

TO: Internal File

THRU: Daron R. Haddock, Permit Supervisor *[Signature]*

FROM: Gregg A. Galecki, Reclamation Specialist III *[Signature]*

RE: 2002 Second Quarter Water Monitoring, Canyon Fuel Company, LLC, Soldier Canyon Mine, C/007/018-WQ02-2

1. Was data submitted for all of the MRP required sites? YES ☒ NO ☐
Identify sites not monitored and reason why, if known:

Well 6-1 has not been monitored due to blockage within the casing. It has not been sampled since 1997 and the Operator has committed to taking it out of the MRP sampling frequency during permit renewal.

2. On what date does the MRP require a five-year resampling of baseline water data.
See Technical Directive 004 for baseline resampling requirements. Consider the five-year baseline resubmittal when responding to question one above. Indicate if the MRP does not have such a requirement.

Resampling due date

No commitment to resample baseline parameters could be found in the MRP.

3. Were all required parameters reported for each site? YES NO X
Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

Due to low snowpack conditions (<70%) as measured on March 1, a special hydrograph monitoring program was initiated in the 2nd quarter, as outlined in the MRP. The special sampling program included both high-flow and low-flow water quality analysis of selected streams and springs, in conjunction with weekly flow-only monitoring of the sites. This information has yet to be prepared and submitted by the Operator; but the commitment is to have the information submitted by March 2003.

4. Were irregularities found in the data?

YES ☒ NO

Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

Of the four (4) samples sent to the lab for analysis all four had Ionic balances outside of the excepted 5 percent margin of error. Ionic balance percentage differences ranged from 7.22 percent to 11.8 percent, respectively.

5. Were DMR forms submitted for all required sites?

1 st month,	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
2 nd month,	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>
3 rd month,	YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NO <input type="checkbox"/>

6. Were all required DMR parameters reported?

YES ☒ NO ☐

Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

No Discharge was recorded during the reporting period. Per a letter sent to all Coal Operators from the Associate Director, all UPDES information needs to be submitted both electronically and in hard copy. Although this is a requirement beginning third (3rd) quarter 2002, information for this quarter was submitted electronically.

7. Were irregularities found in the DMR data?

YES ☐ NO ☒

Comments, including identity of monitoring site:

8. Based on your review, what further actions, if any, do you recommend?

Supplemental information for the 02-2 (2nd) quarter 2002 will be submitted within the next few months. It will be discussed with the Operator the apparent inadequate quality control being seen in the lab they use for analysis.